
Economic Development/Land Use/Rural Issues/Active Transportation Working Group

Survey Results

To spur **Economic Development**, the working group recommended steps be taken to:

- Include economic development as a criterion in the transportation prioritization process. Identify existing, emerging, and future job centers and prioritize infrastructure to serve those areas, particularly where doing so will improve jobs/housing balance. **100% support**
- Align transportation infrastructure, land use, and economic development through:
 - Adequately capitalizing the state infrastructure bank and requiring projects to have an emphasis that support land use and economic development and align with planning. **92.31% support; 7.69 % do not support**
 - Exploring enabling legislation for value capture tools for transportation infrastructure. **100 % support**
 - Utilizing transportation infrastructure as the local match for economic development incentives. **100% support**
 - Exploring the possibility of directing state economic development incentives to encourage companies to locate in lower overall cost development areas – including consideration of the availability of existing infrastructure – and/or areas that best serve job centers and increase access to opportunity. **84.62% support; 15.38% do not support**
- Enhance synchronization between transportation and economic development agencies and stakeholders, including:
 - Structuring a forum for ongoing collaborative discussions.
 - Aligning planning processes and utilization of market data.
 - Utilizing EDCUtah’s Mega Sites program as a pilot for synchronization.
 - Identifying and evaluating opportunities for redevelopment of existing retail areas. **100% support**

To address **Rural Issues**, the working group recommended steps be taken to:

- Improve “Access to Opportunity” – including accessibility to jobs, housing, recreation, education, and work force.
 - Strive to reduce per capita vehicle miles travelled by encouraging:
 - Self-sustaining communities;
 - Development of local job centers;
 - Access to high-speed internet;
 - Telecommuting practices. **100% support**

In the area of **Active Transportation**, the working group recommended the state:

- Help coordinate and implement corridor plans among local governments. **100% support**
- Provide active transportation safe routes. **84.62% support; 15.38% do not support**
- Coordinate with local entities to create connected roadways, street networks, trails, and other modes. **100% support**
- Consider using corridor preservation funds for active transportation funds that connect an origin and a destination and improve access and connectivity. **92.31% support; 7.69% do not support**
- Consider an overall return on investment when funding active transportation, including:
 - Project Usage;
 - Will the project change behavior and reduce per capita VMT?
 - Public Health;

- Air Quality. 100% support

In the area of **Land Use**, the working group recommended the state develop and implement a Corridor and Area Planning (C/AP) process in existing and future corridors of significance to the state. 69.23% support; 30.77% do not support

Development in these high-priority corridors would be strategic and support the long-term growth of the area and an effective transportation system in a manner that maintains the quality of life of the residents. The C/AP process would include:

- Broad goals set by the Legislature to maintain and enhance Utah's economic vitality, quality of life, and access to opportunities
- Identification of corridors by the state (UDOT, Transportation Commission)
- Development and adoption of corridor area plans that address the goals, by the state (UDOT, Transportation Commission), in cooperation with local governments, MPOs, economic development entities, and land owners
- Incentives, disincentives, and penalties for local governments, designed to encourage participation in the creation, adoption, and adherence to a C/AP
 - Incentives could include:
 - Additional “prioritization points” during the programming of transportation projects;
 - Financial and technical assistance to local governments in the form of a Transportation and Land Use Connection (TLC) program;
 - Access to additional funding sources (state infrastructure bank loans, value capture tools)
 - Disincentives could include:
 - The ability of the state to take action when a local government refuses to participate in the creation and adoption of a C/AP
 - Penalties could include:
 - Fees levied by the state when a local government deviates from an agreed-upon C/AP, or delay or not building of all or any part of a project, and/or the reopening of the C/AP process at a cost to the state 53.85% support general outline of C/AP recommendation; 46.15% do not support